



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventors: Marion Wendt-Ginsberg
Frank Wendt

Serial No. 09/646,745

Confirmation No. 6053

Filing Date: November 10, 2000

Examiner: Dung V. Nguyen

Group Art Unit: 3723

International Application No. PCT/EP99/01934

International Filing Date: March 22, 1999

PLATED GRINDING TOOL

Attorney Docket No. 010083

Customer No. 09961

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the United
States Postal Service as Express Mail
No. EL 978301095 US

in an envelope addressed to:
Mail Stop RCE

Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

3/17/04 Maria McArthur
Date - Signature, Paul A. Beck & Associates

Transmittal

Mail Stop RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

March 17, 2004

Dear Commissioner:

Enclosed for filing are the following:

- A. A Request for Continued Examination;
- B. A Photocopy of the Amendment filed on February 12, 2004;
- C. A Petition for Extension of Time; and
- D. Check No. 6294 in the amount of \$1,300.00. \$530.00 is to be applied to the Extension Fee and \$770.00 is to be applied to the Request for Continued Examination Fee.


RECEIVED
MAR 23 2004
TECHNOLOGY CENTER

Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for a 3-month extension of time. The total fee for a three-month extension is \$950.00.

An extension for 2 months has already been submitted with the fee of \$420.00. \$420.00 is deducted from the total fee due of \$950 for the 3rd month of extension now requested. The total amount due for the 3rd month of extension is \$530.00.

The total fee for the RCE is \$770.00. The enclosed check is for \$1,300.00 which is the amount due for the RCE \$770.00 plus \$530.00 for the 3rd month of extension.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul A. Beck", with a date "3/17/04" written below it.

Paul A. Beck
Registration No. 22,289
Paul A. Beck & Associates
Suite 100
1575 McFarland Road
Pittsburgh, PA 15216-1808
Phone 412-343-9700
Fax 412-343-5787



COPY

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventors: Marion Wendt-Ginsberg
Frank Wendt

Serial No. 09/646,745

Confirmation No. 6053

Filing Date: November 10, 2000

Examiner: Dung V. Nguyen

Group Art Unit: 3723

International Application No. PCT/EP99/01934

International Filing Date: March 22, 1999

PLATED GRINDING TOOL

Attorney Docket No. 010083

Customer No. 09961

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the United
States Postal Service as Express Mail
No. EL 97830109505
in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop RA
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date - Signature Paul A. Beck & Associates

Reply to Final Office Action

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

February 12, 2004

Introductory Comments

This is in response to the September 17, 2003 Office Action. The Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Nguyen, for the courtesy extended to Applicant's counsel, John C. Thomas during a telephone interview on November 7, 2003.

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the United
States Postal Service as Express Mail
No. EL 97830063405
in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date - Signature Paul A. Beck & Associates

Substance of November 7, 2003 Interview

Applicant's counsel, John C. Thomas, had a telephone interview with Examiner Nguyen on November 7, 2003. Claim 38 was discussed with respect to U.S. Patent No. 5,871,399 to Emerson. Applicant's counsel pointed out that claim 38 requires "a carrier ring separate from the disk held by the disk" whereas '399 discloses "a support plate 60... with an annular flange 64 at the radially outward end of the support plate." The annular flange 64 is integral to the support plate not separate. Applicant's counsel pointed the Examiner to the cross sections in figure 9 that show that 64 and 60 are the same piece. The Examiner indicated that because there are two reference No.'s and two different names for the parts he considers them to be two separate parts. No agreement was reached with respect to the claims.